REMARKS

This is responsive to the Office Action mailed April 12, 2006. Applicant called the Examiner to clarify the ground of rejection against claim 1, which was explained as being a lack of specificity. Claim 1 has been amended in a manner that is believed to address the Examiner's concern in this regard.

A Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement is also included together with the required fee.

Claims 6 and 8 have been amended to further explicate the claimed structures. None of the references cited disclose what is claimed, i.e., an upper clamping member, a wearshoe and a base, the upper clamping member and wearshoe adapted for mounting engagement with the base at respective opposite sides thereof for clamping the knife, the wearshoe and base having either cooperatively interlocking portions providing the functionality recited in amended claim 6 or cooperatively ramping portions providing the functionality recited in amended claim 8. If the Examiner disagrees, the Examiner is respectfully requested to identify the structures in the references that are being alleged to correspond to the claim elements.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 9 - 17. Claim 9 recites at least the following three features, none of which are disclosed in any of the cited references:

- (1) a ring assembly,
- (2) two end plates,

(3) a plurality of knife assemblies adapted for installation between the end plates such that the shoulder portions of at least two shoulder bolts extend through one of the end plates into the knife assembly.

It is believed claims 1 - 17 are in condition for allowance and the Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to allow claims 1 - 17 and pass the case to issue.

Respectfully,

Garth Janke Reg. No. 40,662

(503) 228-1841